



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,773	10/30/2003	Renzo Colle	34847-349 / 2003P00636US	7784
64280	7590	05/27/2009		EXAMINER
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111			CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/696,773	Applicant(s) COLLE ET AL.
	Examiner Jaime Cardenas-Navia	Art Unit 3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/13/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This **FINAL** office action is in response to communications received on February 27, 2009. Claims 1, 12, and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are currently pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on February 13, 2009 has been considered by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered by the Examiner. In particular, Applicant argues regarding independent claims 1, 12, and 14 that Bansal does not teach or suggest (1) an alert display, (2) an interface for identifying a customer, displaying a list of equipment in response to an identification of a customer as well as a list of types of services, or (3) a scheduling engine which monitors utilization of human resources and displays an alert when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold. Finally, Applicant argues that (4) all dependent claims are allowable as per arguments (1) - (3).

Regarding argument (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bansal clearly teaches an alert display for messages associated with the scheduling information displayed using the planning board display, the alert display being displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display, wherein at least one message includes information associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint (Fig. 2, Fig. 3A, 3B, items 332 and 334. The pop-up alert displayed when the mouse hovers over a person or task contains messages associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint, such as the due date of the task). Bansal does not

teach that the alert display is displayed continuously. However, creating various GUI arrangements are well-known in the art, as suggested by Bansal (par. 33).

Regarding argument (2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bansal clearly teaches an interface for identifying a customer (fig. 1, par. 19, customers associated with activities), displaying a list of equipment in response to an identification of a customer (par. 50, products associated with activity) as well as a list of types of services (par. 49, list of steps that need to be performed).

Regarding argument (3), it is moot, as it pertains to newly amended subject matter. The new grounds of rejection, necessitated by amendment, are presented below.

Regarding argument (4), Examiner respectfully disagrees as per the responses to arguments (1) – (3).

Official Notice

4. The Examiner would like to note the requirements for traversing official notice from MPEP § 2144.03:

To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b).

If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to

be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate [emphasis added].

Because Applicant has not specifically pointed out any errors in the Examiner's action, the officially noticed facts in the previous office action are deemed admitted prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-13 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Bansal et al. (US 2007/0219842 A1) in view of Garry (Breaking Barriers, 09/2002).

Regarding claim 1, Bansal teaches a computer program product embodied on computer readable storage media comprising instructions (par. 129) that when executed generates a graphical user interface (Fig. 2) on a display device for using a computer (par. 130, 131) to schedule the performance of service actions (Fig. 2), the graphical user interface comprising:

 a planning board display in communication with a scheduling engine for scheduling information associated with a period of time (Fig. 2), the scheduling information including:

 resource identifiers, each resource identifier representing a resource and wherein at least one resource identifier represents a human resource and at least one resource identifier represents a reusable resource (Fig. 2, note human resource names, recommended skills, tools, and parts), and

unavailability indications, each unavailability indication representing that a resource represented by one of the resource identifiers is not available to be scheduled for a portion of the period of time for which the scheduling information is being displayed (Fig. 2); and

an alert display in communication with the scheduling engine for messages associated with the scheduling information displayed using the planning board display, the alert display being displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display, wherein at least one message includes information associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint (Fig. 2, Fig. 3A, 3B, items 332 and 334. The pop-up alert displayed when the mouse hovers over a person or task contains messages associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint, such as the due date of the task);

the user interface (i) prompting a user to identify a customer in connection with the initiation of a service to be performed (fig. 1, par. 19, customers associated with activities) and (ii) displaying a list of equipment owned by the customer (par. 50, products associated with activity) and a list of types of services that may be performed (par. 49, list of steps that need to be performed) for each type of equipment in response to the selection of the customer to enable the user to select appropriate equipment and types of services for the service to be performed.

Bansal does not expressly teach that the alert display is continuously displayed without overlapping the planning board display; and

wherein the scheduling engine monitors utilization of human resources and an alert is displayed on the alert display when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold.

Garry teaches wherein the scheduling engine monitors utilization of human resources and an alert is displayed on the alert display when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold (p. 3, par. 3, alerts managers about overtime thresholds and hour limitations for minors are approached).

The disclosures of Bansal and Garry pertain to workforce planning. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Garry does not teach away from or contradict Bansal, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of following all relevant company policies and state labor requirements.

Official notice is given that the arrangement in GUIs of displays, such as the alert display, are old and well-known.

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, as all the necessary information is taught by Bansal, just not the precise layout. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Bansal that different number of frames and layout of frames are within the scope of the invention (par. 33).

Regarding claim 2, Bansal teaches wherein at least one resource identifier represents a non-reusable resource (Fig. 2, screws).

Regarding claim 3, Bansal teaches wherein an unavailability indication for a first resource includes an indication of an association with a second resource for a particular period of time (Fig. 2, par. 37, the skills, parts, and tools associated with the person that is unavailable because they have been assigned to a task).

Regarding claim 4, Bansal teaches wherein the first resource is a human resource, and the second resource is a reusable resource (Fig. 2, par. 37, the skills, parts, and tools associated with the person that is unavailable because they have been assigned to a task is shown).

Regarding claim 5, Bansal teaches wherein the interface includes a relationship control operable to allow a user to associate a first resource identifier representing a first resource in the planning board display with a second resource identifier representing a second resource such that the first resource and the second resource are associated for a particular period of time (Fig. 2, filtering by territory, skills, parts, par. 66, user can drag and drop objects into desired time-frames,par. 67), and

the planning board display includes an association indication of the association of the first resource and the second resource for the particular period of time (Fig. 2, filtering by territory, skills, parts).

Regarding claim 6, Bansal teaches wherein an unavailability indication for a resource includes an indication of a period of time in which the resource is (1) not available and (2) not assigned to a task item (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 7, Bansal teaches wherein the planning board display comprises a planning board window wherein the display position of the planning board window on a display device is controllable by a user (par. 33, 34).

Regarding claim 8, Bansal teaches wherein the planning board display comprises a planning board pane wherein the display position of the planning board pane on a display device is fixed (par. 33, 34).

Regarding claim 9, Bansal teaches wherein the interface comprises a task display for task items to be scheduled wherein the task items to be scheduled include at least one task item requiring a human resource and at least one task item requiring a reusable resource (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 10, Bansal teaches wherein the task display comprises a hierarchical task display for showing a hierarchy of task identifiers, each task identifier representing a task item for a service action to be performed (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 11, Bansal teaches wherein the task display comprises a task display capable of displaying different types of task information for task items, wherein a user identifies types of task information to be displayed for the task items (Fig. 2).

7. **Claims 12-13 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bansal (US 2007/0219842 A1) in view of Garry (Breaking Barriers, 09/2002) and Edinger et al. (US 2002/0194047 A1).

Regarding claim 12, Bansal teaches a computer program product embodied on computer readable storage media comprising instruction (par. 129) that when executed generates a graphical user interface (Fig. 2) on a display device for using a computer (par. 130, 131) to

schedule the performance of service actions that involve activities at multiple locations (Fig. 2),
the graphical user interface comprising:

 a planning board display in communication with a scheduling engine for scheduling
information associated with a period of time (Fig. 2), the scheduling information including:
 resource identifiers, each resource identifier representing a human resource and
 wherein at least one resource identifier represents a field technician and at least one
 resource identifier represents a central workshop technician (Fig. 2, par. 37, depending on
 the technician's skill set, they could either be a field technician or a central workshop
 technician), and

 unavailability indications, each unavailability indication representing at least one
 of the resources represented by one of the resource identifiers is not available to be
 scheduled for a portion of the period of time for which the scheduling information is
 being displayed (Fig. 2);

 a task display in communication with the scheduling engine for showing task identifiers,
the task display being displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display, each
task identifier representing a task for a service action to be performed at a specified location (Fig.
2, 3A, 3B, par. 19), wherein:

 a first task identifier represents a first task item to be performed at a field location
(Fig. 2, 3A, 3B, par. 19)

 a second task identifier represents a second task item to be performed at a central
workshop location that is different from the field location (Fig. 2, 3A, 3B, par. 19), and

the first and second task items are to be completed as part of a service action (par. 19, 68, multiple service personnel may be assigned to the same activity, and though they are assigned to the same activity, they are not required to be assigned to the same location); and

an alert display in communication with the scheduling engine for messages associated with the scheduling information displayed using the planning board display, the alert display being displayed concurrently and adjacent to the planning board display and the task display, wherein at least one message includes information associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint (Fig. 2, Fig. 3A, 3B, items 332 and 334. The pop-up alert displayed when the mouse hovers over a person or task contains messages associated with a constraint other than a resource constraint, such as the due date of the task),

wherein the field technician is associated with the first task item and the central workshop technician is associated with the second task item (Fig. 2, 3A, 3B, par. 19); and

wherein at least one of the first task item and the second item require spare parts (fig. 2, recommended parts, par. 47, SCSI hard disks).

Bansal does not expressly teach:

wherein utilization of one or more of the specified field technicians and the specified central workshop technician is monitored by the scheduling engine and an alert is displayed on the alert display when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold; or

wherein in response to a user initiating the scheduling of a service action via the graphical user interface, an external system is queried to determine whether the required spare parts are available, and if not, a date on which such spare parts are available, and a service

schedule estimate including a planned start date and a planned end date for each task in the service action is presented via the graphical user interface.

Garry teaches wherein utilization of one or more of the specified field technicians and the specified central workshop technician is monitored by the scheduling engine and an alert is displayed on the alert display when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold (p. 3, par. 3, alerts managers about overtime thresholds and hour limitations for minors are approached, 'field technician' and 'central workshop technician' constitutes non-functional descriptive material).

The disclosures of Bansal and Garry pertain to workforce planning. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Garry does not teach away from or contradict Bansal, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of following all relevant company policies and state labor requirements.

Neither Bansal nor Garry teach wherein in response to a user initiating the scheduling of a service action via the graphical user interface, an external system is queried to determine whether the required spare parts are available, and if not, a date on which such spare parts are available, and a service schedule estimate including a planned start date and a planned end date for each task in the service action is presented via the graphical user interface.

Edinger teaches wherein in response to a user initiating the scheduling of a service action via the graphical user interface, an external system is queried to determine whether the required spare parts are available, and if not, a date on which such spare parts are available, and a service schedule estimate including a planned start date and a planned end date for each task in the service action is presented via the graphical user interface (par. 74, 75, Global Parts System, tracks parts inventory, shipping, location, etc.).

The inventions of Bansal, Garry, and Edinger pertain to workforce planning. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Edinger does not teach away from or contradict Bansal or Garry, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Bansal of tracking assignment of parts to activities (fig. 2, 234d, par. 43).

Regarding claim 13, Bansal teaches wherein:

the first task item includes a field human resource skill requirement (Fig. 2, par. 7),
the second task item includes a central workshop human resource skill requirement (Fig. 2, par. 7),
information associated with the resource identifier representing the field technician includes an indication of a skill possessed by the field technician (Fig. 2, par. 7),

information associated with the resource identifier representing the central workshop technician includes an indication of a skill possessed by the central workshop technician (Fig. 2, par. 7),

the field technician is associated with the first task item only when the indication of the skill possessed by the field technician matches the field human resource skill requirement of the first task item (Fig. 2, par. 7), and

the central workshop technician is associated with the second task item only when the indication of the skill possessed by the central workshop technician matches the central workshop human resource skill requirement of the second task item (Fig. 2, par. 7).

8. **Claims 14-18 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bansal (US 2007/0219842 A1) in view of Katiyar et al. (US 5,732,399) and Garry (Breaking Barriers, 09/2002).

Regarding claim 14, Bansal teaches a computer program product embodied on computer readable storage media (par. 129) comprising instructions that when executed generates a graphical user interface on a display device for using a computer to schedule the performance of service actions (Fig. 2, par. 130, 131), the graphical user interface comprising:

a planning board in communication with a scheduling engine scheduling information associated with a period of time that includes a chart identifying resources for which a user associated with the planning board is responsible (Fig. 2);

controls associated with the planning board, the controls comprising an assignment control to assign a service order item to a resource, a time specification control to identify a

time period when a resource is unavailable for reasons other than an assignment, and a relationship control to create a temporary connection between a tool and a human resource (fig. 2);

a work list providing a view of service order items for which the user is responsible (fig. 2, planned activities frame, can be filtered by employee (234b));

a hot list providing a non-hierarchical list capable of displaying different views of open service items for which the user is responsible (fig. 2, planned activities frame, can be filtered by employee (234b)); and

an alert monitor in communication with the scheduling engine displaying a list of alerts the selection of which causes potential time slots displayed in the planning board that are related to the selected alert to be highlighted (fig. 2, unplanned activities frame, par. 69, selecting an unplanned activity highlights available time slots);

wherein in response to a user initiating the scheduling of a service action and assigning resources to the service action via the graphical user interface, it is determined whether non-resource contractual constraints exist that are based on contracts with a customer associated with the service action that constrain tasks for the service action, and if so, presenting a user with an alert indicating same (par. 4, time constraints imposed by service agreements, par. 69, possible times available for scheduling of an activity are indicated by highlighting, time constraint information is extracted).

Bansal does not expressly teach a work list providing a hierarchical view of service order items for which the user is responsible;

an alert monitor displaying a list of alerts the selection of which causes corresponding assignments displayed in the planning board that are related to the selected alert to be highlighted; and

wherein the scheduling engine monitors utilization of human resources and an alert is displayed on the alert display when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold.

Official notice is given that various methods of displaying information, specifically hierarchical and non-hierarchical views, are old and well-known in the art. Examiner believes the only difference between the work list and the hot list is this difference in how the information is displayed.

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Bansal of both hierarchical (fig. 2, unplanned activities frame) and non-hierarchical (fig. 2, planned activities frame) views of information as well as the teaching that different number of frames and layout of frames are within the scope of the invention (par. 33).

Katiyar teaches an alert monitor displaying an alert containing a list of corresponding assignments (col. 9, lines 62-67, col. 10, lines 1-5).

The inventions of Katiyar and Bansal pertain to managing schedules. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Katiyar does not

teach away from or contradict Bansal, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage in avoiding conflicts by alerting the user of all related assignments.

Garry teaches wherein the scheduling engine monitors utilization of human resources and an alert is displayed on the alert display when such utilization exceeds a pre-determined threshold (p. 3, par. 3, alerts managers about overtime thresholds and hour limitations for minors are approached).

The disclosures of Bansal, Katiyar, and Garry pertain to workforce planning. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Garry does not teach away from or contradict Bansal or Katiyar, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage of following all relevant company policies and state labor requirements.

Regarding claim 15, Bansal teaches a confirm control that allows the user to eliminate a selected alert such that the alert is not displayed in the graphical user interface and a confirm globally control that allows a user to eliminate a selected alert such that the alert is not displayed in a graphical user interface for the user and for other users (fig. 2, par. 66, it is strongly implied

that when an unplanned activity is entered into the calendar and becomes a planned activity, it is no longer in any user's unplanned activities frame).

Regarding claim 16, Bansal teaches wherein the list of alerts is dynamically updated (par. 65).

Bansal does not expressly teach wherein the list of alerts is dynamically updated based on new scheduling choices.

Katiyar teaches wherein the alerts are dynamically updated based on new scheduling choices (col. 9, lines 62-67, col. 10, lines 1-5).

The inventions of Katiyar and Bansal pertain to managing schedules. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Katiyar does not teach away from or contradict Bansal, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage in scheduling accuracy by keeping the alerts as updated as possible.

Regarding claim 17, Bansal does not expressly teach wherein the scheduling choices comprise one or more of assignments, time specifications, and relationships.

Katiyar teaches wherein the scheduling choices comprise one or more of assignments, time specifications, and relationships (col. 9, lines 62-67, col. 10, lines 1-5).

The inventions of Katiyar and Bansal pertain to managing schedules. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements

as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Katiyar does not teach away from or contradict Bansal, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the advantage in scheduling accuracy by keeping the alerts as updated as possible.

Regarding claim 18, Bansal teaches wherein each alert in the list identifies a category to which the alert is associated and includes a message number and an alert description (fig. 2, unplanned activities frame, category is "Pending Field Engineer Activities", number is "FEA-235235", alert description is "Repair HD on-site").

9. **Claim 19 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bansal (US 2007/0219842 A1) in view of Katiyar et al. (US 5,732,399) and Garry (Breaking Barriers, 09/2002) as applied to claim 14, further in view of Edinger et al. (US 2002/0194047 A1).

Regarding claim 19, neither Bansal, Katiyar, nor Garry expressly teach wherein the list of alerts is dynamically updated based on an importance factor associated with a corresponding customer for whom the service is being performed and based on a due date of a corresponding task or service order.

Edinger teaches wherein the list of alerts is dynamically updated based on an importance factor associated with a corresponding customer for whom the service is being performed and based on a due date of a corresponding task or service order (par. 334, raising alerts, status is importance factor, service delivery commitments are due date).

The inventions of Bansal, Katiyar, Garry, and Edinger pertain to workforce planning. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Edinger does not teach away from or contradict either Bansal, Katiyar, or Garry, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old and well-known elements, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Bansal of priority of tasks (par. 61) and due dates of tasks (par. 69).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Junger (US 6,269,344 B1) teaches a status display screen with a number and status.

Jones et al. (US 6,219,648 B1) teaches list of alerts updated based on customer priority and task due date.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaime Cardenas-Navia whose telephone number is (571)270-1525. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:30AM - 7:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley Bayat can be reached on (571) 272-6704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

/Bradley B Bayat/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624